

REMARKS

I. Introduction

In response to the Office Action dated December 19, 2006, claims 11, 23, 35, 41, 45, and 49 have been amended, and claims 50-52 have been added. Claims 1-52 remain in the application. Claims 1-10, 13-22, 25-34, 38-40, 42-44, and 46-48 have been withdrawn from consideration and claims 11-12, 23-24, 35-37, 41, 45, 49, and 50-52 are currently pending. Re-examination and re-consideration of the application, as amended, is requested.

II. Prior Art Rejections

Pages 2-4 of the Office Action, claims 11, 12, 23, 24, 35-37, 41, 45 and 49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of the combination of Berstis and DeLorme.

Specifically, the independent claims were rejected as follows:

Regarding claim 11, Berstis teaches a system for accessing geographic information comprising:

- (a) a thin client (figure 1);
- (b) an application on the thin client, the application configured to
 - (i) request map data from a server (figure 3; col. 4, line 57 to col. 5, line 2);
 - (ii) receive, in response to the request a single mapset constructed prior to the server receiving the request, wherein the single mapset comprises an initial map and a zoomed map (abstract; figure 5; col. 5, lines 53-65; col. 7, lines 13-20) the map data in a file constructed prior to the server receiving the request (col. 7, lines 13-20);
 - (iii) format the map data in the single mapset (col. 2, lines 20-25);
 - (iv) display the map data on a screen of the thin client (col. 2, lines 52-60).

Claims 23-24 have similar limitations as claims 11-12, therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 35-37 have similar limitations as claims 11-12, therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 41,45 and 49 have similar limitations as claim 11, therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

III. Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

Independent claims 11, 23, and 35 are directed towards a thin client used to access geographic information (see page 8, lines 22-23). More specifically, an application on a thin client requests map data from a servlet (see FIG. 1; page 17, lines 11-15; page 18, lines 6-8; FIG. 3). The map data is then received by the thin client in the form of a mapset (see page 22, lines 1-5).

The claims specifically provide that the mapset contains map data for two (2) or more maps (see page 19, line 19-page 20, line 4). Further, the claims also specifically provide that the mapset was constructed prior to the servlet receiving the request from the thin client (see page 9, lines 10-18; page 18, lines 15-18; page 20, lines 5-13; FIG. 4; FIG. 5; page 21, lines 2-15; page 22, lines 3-5; page 23, lines 7-10; and page 24, lines 4-5).

In addition, the amended claims now provide that the single mapset containing the multiple maps is constructed on a per-user basis (see page 20, lines 5-7). Thus, not only do the claims provide that the mapset is constructed prior to receiving a request from a thin client, but the mapset is constructed on a per user basis. The benefits and use of such a per-user construction are further set forth with respect to the new dependent claims (see below).

Once the mapset is received, the thin client formats and displays the mapdata from the mapset on a screen of the PDA (see page 16, lines 9-15; page 17, line 22-page 18, line 5; page 28, lines 5-7).

Dependent claims 12, 24, and 36 provide that the request from the PDA to the servlet is a “GET” HTTP request (see page 21, line 16-page 22, line 5). As known in the art and set forth in the specification, such a GET request retrieves whatever information is identified by a request that specifies a uniform resource identifier (URI).

Dependent claim 37 merely specifies that the article of manufacture set forth in independent claim 35 is a personal digital assistant.

Independent claims 41, 45, and 49 provide a system, method, and article of manufacture respectively for accessing geographic information (see page 8, lines 22-23). All of the claim sets are from the perspective of a thin client and not the server perspective with limitations similar to those set forth in independent claims 11, 23, and 35. Initially, map data is requested from a servlet (see FIG. 1; page 17, lines 11-15; page 18, lines 6-8; FIG. 3). The next step in all of the claims diverges from the steps set forth in independent claims 11, 23, and 35. In this regard, the claims specifically provide that the map data in a mapset was constructed in parallel on multiple processing units (see page 9, lines 4-9; page 11, lines 9-14; page 12, line 22; page 15, lines 14-17; page 20, lines 11-21; page 22, lines 3-5; page 23, lines 7-14; FIGS. 3, 4, and 5). The remaining steps format and display the data as in claims 11, 23, and 35 (see page 16, lines 9-15; page 17, line 22-page 18, line 5; page 28, lines 5-7).

New dependent claims 50-52 provide that the two or more maps included in the single mapset are based on one or more work orders for a specific user (i.e., consistent with the per-user basis construction). The benefits of such user-based work orders and construction of a mapset prior to receiving a request from a user are set forth in more detail on page 18, line 19-page 19, line 4 and page 20, line 5-page 22, line 5 of the specification as filed. In particular Applicants direct the attention of the Examiner to page 21, lines 2-15:

FIG. 5 illustrates the asynchronous creation of a mapset/map data 408 by servlet 108. The invention may be utilized by utility, plumbing, construction, or other similar type industries wherein field technicians 504 perform repairs, installations, etc. A dispatcher 502 establishes one or more work orders 406 each day for each field technician 504. Accordingly, dispatcher 502 controls the dispatching application 402 wherein a work order 406 may be saved in a back-end database 508. Once a work order 406 is entered by dispatcher 502, the dispatching application 402 transmits a request to create, modify, add, or delete a map/mapset that contains the map data 408 for the work order 406. The request is transmitted across the internal network (e.g., intranet 510) to the server 106 (e.g., a hyper text transfer protocol (HTTP) server or web server 110). The request is forwarded to servlet 108 that creates, deletes, or modifies the map data 408 based on the request. Accordingly, the mapset 408 is pre-constructed by servlet 108 on a per-user 508 basis prior to the mapset/data 408 being requested by the user 508.

IV. Argument

Applicants traverse the rejections set forth in the Office Action. Namely, neither Berstis nor DeLorme teach, disclose, or suggest the construction of a mapset containing multiple maps on a per-user basis.

As set forth in the Summary above, there are numerous advantages to constructing a mapset on a per-user basis. For example, individual and particular users may have a need for a more specific or defined set of maps. However, merely establishing a set of maps without reference to a particular user or on a per user basis ignores such a need. For example, as set forth in the new dependent claims, a mapset may include maps needed for a particular work order or set of work orders for a utility person (e.g., plumber, electrician, etc.). The maps may be gathered on the server side prior to the utility person even requesting the mapset. Such pre-construction of the mapset for the particular user expedites the time when the user connects to the server to retrieve the data. In the prior art, the user was required to wait while the server gathered the map data to satisfy the user's request. Such server-side processing is no longer a bottleneck in the present invention.

Further, the Office Action and prior art fail to address such a need or the advantages set forth by the present invention. Instead, the prior art (i.e., Berstis and DeLorme) are consistent with the prior art implementations and completely fail to address work orders or mapsets that are constructed on a per-user basis.

In addition to the above, and consistent with the prior Decision on Appeal, the Applicants have specifically set forth that the single mapset contains multiple maps.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that both Berstis and DeLorme completely fails to describe, teach, suggest, or allude to multiple aspects of the presently claimed invention.

In addition, the various elements of Applicants' claimed invention together provide operational advantages over the systems disclosed in Berstis and DeLorme. In addition, Applicants' invention solves problems not recognized by Berstis and/or Delorme (either alone or in combination).

V. Conclusion

Applicants submit that independent claims 11, 23, 35, 41, 45, and 49 are allowable over Berstis and DeLorme. Further, dependent claims 12, 24, 36-37, and 50-52 are submitted to be allowable over Berstis and DeLorme in the same manner, because they are dependent on independent claims 11, 23, 35, 41, 45, and 49, respectively, and thus contain all the limitations of the independent claims. In addition, dependent claims 12, 24, 36-37, and 50-52 recite additional novel elements not shown by Berstis and DeLorme.

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is now in good order for allowance and such allowance is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner believe minor matters still remain that can be resolved in a telephone interview, the Examiner is urged to call Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

GATES & COOPER LLP
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

Howard Hughes Center
6701 Center Drive West, Suite 1050
Los Angeles, California 90045
(310) 641-8797

Date: March 19, 2007

By: /Jason S. Feldmar/
Name: Jason S. Feldmar
Reg. No.: 39,187

JSF/sjm

G&C 30566.112-US-U1